

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/609,483	MURASHITA, KIMITAKA
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sam Rimell	2164	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sam Rimell. (3) Mellissa Chojnacki.
 (2) Thomas L. Jones. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7/6/2007

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed nature of keyword extracting unit and examiners suggested proposed clarifications to this structure. For clarification, discussed possible clarification "...presence or absence of an updating area of the obtained information". Also discussed keyword extraction being triggered by update. Applicant's representative pointed out that event collecting destination site and information collecting destination site were two distinct sites. Examiners will reconsider claim 1 on this point. Applicant will take suggestions under advisement. Also suggested drafting claims, 8, 18 and 28 as independent claims.